

E

384

3

C279

Carey, Math. 2-1-

The dissolution of the union.

A sober address to all those who have
any interest in the welfare, the peace,
the glory, or the happiness of the
United States.

Philadelphia, 1832.



Class E384

Book C279³







THE
DISSOLUTION OF THE UNION.
A Sober Address

TO ALL THOSE WHO HAVE ANY INTEREST IN THE WELFARE, THE
 POWER, THE GLORY, OR THE HAPPINESS OF THE
UNITED STATES.

—○○○○—
 "UNITED WE STAND—DIVIDED WE FALL."
 —○○○○—

"Frenzied be the head—palsied be the arm—of him who attempts to dissolve the Union."—Gen. Eaton, the hero of Derne.

"I have been reared in a reverential affection for the Union. My imagination has led me to look into the distant future, and there to contemplate the greatness of free America.

"I have beheld her walking on the waves of the mighty deep, carrying along with her tidings of great joy to distant nations. I have seen her overturning the strong places of despotism, and restoring to man his long-lost rights. *Wo, wo, betide that man who shall sow the seeds of disunion among us! better for him he had never been born. If he call upon the mountains to hide him—nay, if he bury himself in the very centre of the earth, the indignation of mankind will find him out, and blast him with its lightnings.*"—The Hon. John Tyler, formerly Governor of, and at present Senator of the U. States from, Virginia.

"Cherish a cordial, habitual and immoveable attachment to the union; accustoming yourselves to think and speak of it as the palladium of your political safety and prosperity; discountenancing whatever may suggest even a suspicion that it can in any event be abandoned; and *indignantly frowning upon the first downing of every attempt to alienate any part of our country from the rest, or to ensoble the sacred ties which now link together the various parts.*"—General Washington's Farewell Address.

"The union. It must be preserved."—President Jackson.

"The union. Nothing short of insufferable oppression, actually felt, and not *inferred from doubtful premises*, should make a wise man wish its dissolution."—James Lowndes, Esq.

"Permit me, Sir, to make one or two observations upon the competency of the State governments to resist the authority or the execution of a law of Congress. What kind of resistance can they make which is constitutional? I KNOW OF BUT ONE KIND; AND THAT IS BY ELECTIONS. The People and the States have a right to change the members of the National Legislature, and in that way, AND IN THAT ALONE, can they effect a change of the measures of this Government. It is true there is another kind of resistance which may be made, but is UNKNOWN TO THE CONSTITUTION. This resistance depends upon physical force—it is an appeal to the sword; and *by the sword must that appeal be decided*, and not by the provisions of the Constitution."—W. H. Crawford, Esq., Ex-Secretary of the Treasury of the United States.

—◆—
 BY A CITIZEN OF PENNSYLVANIA.
 —◆—

Philadelphia:

PRINTED BY JOHN BLOREN.

August 25, 1832.

[Gratuitous]

E 384
.3
C279

244434
'17

PREFACE.

THE charge of fickleness will lie against me for once more taking up the pen on this subject ; as it is only a month since I took my leave of it, as I thought for ever. For this charge I care not. The magnitude of the subject and object affords full justification. I am led to this trespass by an ardent desire to endeavour to preserve the peace and union of the country, and by the horror which the “deep damnation” of a dissolution of the Union, with all its tremendous consequences, is so well calculated to excite.

The high degree of exasperation, falling little short of frenzy, that prevails on the subject of the protecting system in South Carolina, cannot excite much astonishment, when we consider the means that have been employed to produce it. Never was a cause advocated with more zeal, ardour, and industry, nor with a more liberal expenditure of money, than has been the cause of nullification, and by necessary consequence, of a dissolution of the Union. For as sure as there is a heaven above us, so sure the present measures of the nullifiers will eventuate in a dissolution, unless energetic measures of counteraction be adopted. One item of expense, altogether unexampled in this country, within the same space of time, deserves attention. About a year since, a resolution was adopted by the “state rights’ party,” to print 10,000 pamphlets per month. At three cents each, which is a moderate estimate, the expense per annum would be \$3,600. Agents, it is confidently asserted, are employed to distribute them, not merely in South Carolina, but in the neighbouring states, in order to induce them to make common cause. This item costs, probably, half the amount of the printing, making a total of five thousand dollars, to prepare the public mind for a forcible repeal, by a single state, of a law of the United States, passed, as is asserted, by a “reckless majority.” This is a favourite phrase—and it is no new case. All “majorities” that will not let the minority rule, are stigmatized as “reckless” and tyrannical.

In the composition of these pamphlets, talents of the first order are employed. However fallacious, they are to the last degree plausible, and admirably calculated ad captandum. It is easy to conceive how powerful must be the effect of such a system, steadily and zealously pursued under the auspices of some of the most talented and influential men in the country. Their efforts are already powerfully felt in Georgia, and are extending to Alabama, North Carolina and Virginia.

Some idea may be formed of the unholy means employed to poison the minds of the citizens of South Carolina—to inflame their passions against their fellow citizens—and to prepare them for rebellion, from the following statement taken from the Charleston Mercury, by which the public are persuaded that the federal government raises taxes from the poor to the amount of 40 per cent. of their respective incomes!

"Federal Officers and Non-Convention Men are so anxious to support themselves, and fatten upon the *industrious men's* means; and knowing that *these* are the *principal sufferers*, they avoid noticing the poor man's expenses, and publish that of the rich, who are comparatively few, and scarcely feel the tariff, as their purchases amount to a small portion of their income. It is this overwhelming majority of Southerners, namely, the poor and industrious, that Mr. M'Duffie alludes to, when he says, the taxes are levied upon exports. Most planters, mechanics, manufacturers, and tradesmen, do not make, these *Colonization* and *Tariff* days, more than their families' necessities require—as, for example, if a man or widow makes and spends

60 dollars in cash, 20 dollars of it will be taken away by the tariff, as a tax for Northern Roads and Canals, being 40 per cent; of course leaving the owner but thirty dollars to meet family expenses!

100 Dollars,	deduct Tax, 40,	leaves the owner	60
300 do. do.	120, do. do.	180	
500 do. do.	200, do. do.	300	
700 do. do.	280, do. do.	420	
1000 do. do.	400, do. do.	600	

"My means being small, family large, and expenditure necessarily amounting to my income, (300 dollars) on which I pay taxes 120 dollars, leaving my family but 180 dollars, I have made out the above statement for the information of those similarly situated with myself, that they may know what proportion of their hard earnings is taken under the tariff law, to enrich the Northern Monopolists, and fatten Southern Federal Officers, and which is *never returned* in the shape of money to the Wife and Children of an abused

"SOUTHERNER.

"N. B.—*The next question to be agitated, if we submit now, will be the Colonization Act—another word for EMANCIPATION.*"

It is more than probable that few of our citizens are aware of the precipice which yawns to swallow up the Union, and how near we are to our blessed confederacy being "resolved into its original elements." For the information of all such as are ignorant on the subject, it cannot be improper to state the views of the nullifiers of South Carolina, as boldly developed by themselves.

Should they have a majority in the next legislature, as is almost certain, from the extraordinary exertions they are making, it is intended to pass an act to annul the tariff, in the following form as stated in the Charleston Evening Post, one of their leading papers, on the 10th ult. :

"Whereas, the freedom of the citizens of these States from all taxation beyond that required for the necessary wants of Government, is one of the most sacred amongst the rights and privileges guaranteed to them by the Federal Constitution, and the preservation whereof is essential to secure the liberty of the people, and to protect the Constitution from violation—And, whereas it is well known, and undeniable, that a duty of 12 per cent. on our imports is sufficient for the wants of Government :

"Be it enacted, That if any person shall collect or receive, or be aiding or abetting in collecting or receiving any amount of duties on the imports made into this State beyond the said rate of 12 per cent. ad valorem, every such person so offending, shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, and shall be apprehended, committed, and tried therefor, as in other cases of misdemeanors, before the Court of Common Pleas and General Sessions of this State; and being thereof convicted by the verdict of a Jury, shall be adjudged to suffer imprisonment for a term not exceeding one year, and shall pay a fine not exceeding Two Thousand Dollars; which imprisonment and fine shall be assessed by a Jury!

"And if any person shall be arrested or imprisoned, or his property or his goods seized, for, or on account of the non-payment of a higher rate of duties, such person may apply to the said Court, or any Judge thereof in vacation, for a writ of Habeas Corpus for the release of his person, or a Writ of Replevin for the release of his goods, which writs shall forthwith be granted him as of common right, upon proper affidavits of the facts alleged; and it shall be the duty of the said Court, or the said Judge, on the

return of the said writ, to liberate the said individual, or his said goods, on payment of the said 12 per cent.

"*And be it further enacted*, That all Bonds given for a higher rate of duties than the said 12 per cent. shall be, and are hereby declared to be, void in this State, so far as the condition of said Bonds shall exceed the said rate of 12 per cent— and all juries in this State are authorized and directed to find accordingly."

Should the President dare attempt to enforce the execution of the tariffact by the means the constitution has placed at his command for that purpose, the next step in the ladder of dissolution, is to adopt the following resolution, which is recommended by high authority :

"*Resolved*, That if, in consequence of the proceedings of South Carolina, to protect her citizens against the operation of this unjust and unconstitutional system of laws, any attempt to use force and coercion against this State, shall take place by direction of the General government, it shall be the bounden duty of the Governor of this State, to write forthwith to the President of the United States, and to inform him, that on the expiration of one calendar month from the date of that information, the State of South Carolina will be proclaimed and declared to be no longer a member of the North American United States, unless such force and coercion be instantly withdrawn. And the Governor, in case of its continuance, notwithstanding such information, shall issue his proclamation accordingly on the day designated, that the State of South Carolina is, and will continue thenceforward to be in all respects, sovereign and independent, and no longer remains a member of the American Union."

It is asserted that they count largely on foreign interference to protect them against the attempts of the general government to coerce them.— This idea is rendered probable by the following view of the subject, taken from the *Mercury*, the most powerful advocate of nullification :

"Suppose Charleston a FREE PORT, exacting no duties on entry or exit—or, at the very utmost, five per cent, ad valorem, on imports—a free port, where the vessels of every nation upon earth might bring, without let or hindrance, what they have to sell, and purchase freely what we can supply ! *what a city would it be in five years !* what a depot for the transatlantic world ! what a scene for commercial agency ! And what nation would molest a free port, which is the port of every nation—which all nations are deeply interested in promoting and guaranteeing ? And what other taxes do we need, in that case, than the same taxes we now raise ? And what danger have we to fear ? Who molests Lubec, Hamburgh, Bremen ? WOULD EUROPE PERMIT A FREE PORT TO BE BLOCKADED ? AND WHERE ARE THE TAXES TO BE OBTAINED, TO PAY THE EXPENSES OF AN HOSTILE ATTACK UPON US BY OUR QUONDAM FRIENDS ?"

What has been done or is doing, to counteract this system, fraught with the seeds of civil commotion, with all its fearful train of evils ? Comparatively very little. The Union party in the state, it is true, have displayed in their newspapers very considerable talent ; but it is there, as it is here : few read any newspapers but those of their own party ; and therefore the universal dissemination of the pamphlets, by the nullifiers, to friends and foes, gives the latter an immense advantage over their antagonists. And this advantage was prodigiously increased by the fact that the Union party assumed the ground of the unconstitutionality and injustice of the protecting system. This was placing irresistible weapons in the hands of their adversaries. How rational men can hold this doctrine in opposition to the luminous view of the subject given by President Jackson, —to pass over all other arguments—which, in the minds of men free from prejudice, settles the question for ever beyond the power of cavil, it is

difficult to conceive. This view has been frequently quoted, but cannot be too often presented to the public eye.

"The power to impose duties on imports originally belonged to the several states. The right to adjust these duties, with a view to the encouragement of domestic branches of industry, is so completely incidental to that power, that it is difficult to suppose the existence of one without the other. The states have delegated their whole authority over imports to the general government without limitation or restriction, saving the very inconsiderable reservation relating to their inspection laws. This authority having thus entirely passed from the states, the right to exercise it for the purpose of protection, does not exist in them, and consequently, if it be not possessed by the general government, it must be extinct. Our political system would thus present the anomaly of a people stripped of the right to foster their own industry; and to counteract the most selfish and destructive policy which might be adopted by foreign nations. This surely cannot be the case: This indispensable power, thus surrendered by the states, must be within the scope of the authority on this subject, expressly delegated to Congress."—*President Jackson's Message to Congress, Dec. 6, 1830.*

To this let me add the pointed admission of the Free Trade Convention, the Delphic oracle of nullification, that "Congress may countervail the regulations of a foreign power that may be hostile to our commerce."

What has been done in the other states to disabuse the public mind in South Carolina, by the friends of the protecting system and of the peace and prosperity of the country and the permanence of the Union? Almost nothing. The whole expenditure, directed particularly to the illumination of South Carolina, to counteract the efforts of the advocates of nullification, has not, from the middle of 1828 till the same period of 1831, equalled the expenditure of two months in favour of nullification! In the year 1828, when insurrectionary views fully developed themselves, and assumed a most formidable aspect—when we were threatened publicly, in addresses received with acclamation, with "*the state rising in the majesty of its strength*"—with "*a renewal of the scenes of the revolution*"—an attempt was made to produce a counteracting association in defence of the Union, at an expense of twenty-five dollars a head—and in the four great cities of Boston, New York, Philadelphia and Baltimore, there could not be found twenty, ten or even five, who would unite for such a holy purpose; although application was made, at two different periods, in the most urgent and impressive style, to from fifty to seventy wealthy individuals, all of them deeply interested in the protecting system.—Of course the project was abandoned. History can furnish but few instances of such dire insanity as regards personal interest, and such total indifference to the public welfare, as this case exhibits. The actual effervescence of the public mind to the South may be in a great degree chargeable to this miserable neglect of duty. Even at present, when the evil approaches us nearer daily, and when the spirit of disaffection is spreading widely, the same torpor, apathy, and economy prevail. In the expense of these publications I am unable to find a single person to unite!!! So much more energy, ardour and liberality are displayed to pull down than to support the fabric of government! This, however, is nothing new. It has been the case at all times,—one thousand men have in all countries been more efficient to overturn, than ten thousand to uphold a government. On one side there is unity of purpose and of action. The cause becomes to a certain degree a personal one. Whereas, on the other side, it is regarded as a public question, in which no individual has

any particular interest—and, to use a very trite, but very just aphorism, “*what is every body’s business, is nobody’s business.*” Two cases from history will sufficiently prove the correctness of this doctrine. When the Prince of Orange landed in England in 1687, not one man in ten, perhaps in a hundred, throughout the nation, had any idea of a change of dynasty.* This applies to the Churchills, the Halifaxes, the Shrewsburys, the Godolphins, and most of those who figured under William and Mary. The utmost they looked for was to restrain the power of the bigot James within legal and constitutional limits.

Again:—In the beginning of 1776, not one man in ten, perhaps not one in a hundred in the British provinces contemplated independence.—And the most popular man in the country could not at that time have proposed it with safety.

And now, were the whole of the southern states polled, man by man, and the naked question put to them, whether they would tear down the sacred fabric of our government, the admiration of the civilized world, and have this noble nation, whose power, and influence, and glory are indissolubly connected with its union, divided into two, three or four separate republics, with jarring and hostile interests, the sport and instruments of the jealous nations of Europe,—there would, I have no doubt, be a majority of ten, perhaps fifty to one against the deleterious measure—but it requires no spirit of prophecy to see clearly that unless the friends of a confederated government, not merely in the southern states, but throughout the Union, act with more zeal and energy, and concentration of effort to disabuse the public mind, the Union will not last two years. They may close their eyes to this fatal result; but, I repeat, without they pursue a different system, they will soon be awakened to a hideous state of things, which will excite deep remorse and anguish at their present torpor.

“Nullification is a creature of circumstances. Its import is not yet settled. It is made to mean whatever will best suit the company in which it is introduced. It has become a fashionable instrument in the hands of its advocates to play upon the passions and prejudices of honest men, whose feelings they spare no pains, nor labor to rouse and animate. It flourishes most in towns and villages. Three or four of those nullifying gentlemen meet a company of highly respectable, honest men from the country, who, being perfectly honest themselves, are naturally led to believe every body else is so; and from that uncontaminated purity of mind which they have cherished through life, unacquainted with the fantastic tricks and stratagems of aspiring politicians, their honest credulity is practised upon. They are first informed, gravely, that they are laboring under heavy burdens from the tariff, of which they are totally ignorant. To illustrate this latent burden, some nullifying philosopher is called, and after a metaphysical lecture of half an hour long, he concludes by assuring them that THEY MOST UNDOUBTEDLY PAY, EVERY YEAR, FORTY BALES OF THEIR COTTON OUT OF EVERY HUNDRED, TO THE *Yankees*, AS A BOUNTY TO THEIR MANUFACTURERS; and that they will be ground into dust unless they will join the nullifiers, as the only means of putting it down.”—Judge Smith’s Speech, Aug. 1st, 1831.

* The question of installing the Prince as King, was carried in the House of Lords, after ardent debates, by a meagre majority of two—51 to 49.—Hume, vol. iv. p. 467.

DISSOLUTION OF THE UNION.*

NO. 1.



This confederacy is young. Little more than half a century has rolled over its head, and yet three times has the ill-omened, deleterious, and let me add, thrice-accursed project of a dissolution of the Union been pressed on the public attention by discontented, disaffected, or ambitious men, desirous of change, and regardless of the warning voice of history, which, on its ensanguined pages, records the sad and sickening story of the desolating wars of conterminous states, destitute of any common umpire to decide their differences. It is only necessary to mention the Peloponnesian wars, whereby Athens, the pride and glory of Greece, after an arduous and protracted struggle of 27 years, was laid prostrate in the dust—the wars of Italy, till Rome swallowed up all her rivals in the boundless extent of her iron domination—the wars of the Picts and English, when the latter, in the extremity of their distress, invoked the aid of the Saxons, who terminated the strife by the subjugation of those by whom they were invited into the island—the civil wars of the Italian republics, in the middle ages, in which the weaker party almost always called in the aid of some rival state, which generally, like the kite with the warlike frogs, seized upon and subjugated both of the contending parties—the border wars of England and Scotland—the wars in France before the establishment of one common government ruling over the whole nation—and though last, not least admonitory, the horrible wars among the soi-disant republics in our own hemisphere. To the admonitions held out by these histories, nothing but the most dire infatuation can be deaf or dumb.



FIRST PROJECT OF THE DISSOLUTION OF THE UNION.

THE first attempt was at an early period, in the year 1796, only seven years after the organization of the government. A series of papers, with that view, appeared at Hartford, Conn. written by some citizens of high standing and considerable talent. The ground assumed was the impossibility of maintaining a permanent union between states so dissimilar in habits, manners and customs, as the people of the south were to those of the middle and eastern states. The leading objection was the existence of slavery to the south, although at that period slavery existed in Connecticut, and in every other state in the union, except Massachusetts, where

* A portion of this Essay was originally published in the year 1810.

it was annulled merely by the construction of that clause in the constitution, which declares that "all men are born free and equal."

The wickedness and hollowness of this plea are palpable from the fact, that slavery might have been abolished in Connecticut without much difficulty or inconvenience; as the number of slaves then in that state was only about 20,000—and had they been liberated by law, as has since been done in the state of New York, the owners would not have suffered much, if any, real injury—as the services of the negroes, if emancipated, could be purchased at but little more than they actually cost their masters for food and clothes.

Extracts from an Essay signed Pelham, in the Connecticut Courant, published at Hartford, in Connecticut, republished in the New World, a Philadelphia paper, printed by S. H. Smith, November 30, 1796.

"We have reached a critical period in our political existence. The question must soon be decided, *whether we will continue a nation, at the expense even of our Union, or sink encumbered with the present mass of difficulty into confusion and slavery.* On a subject so interesting as this, it is hazardous to speak. But it is still more hazardous to remain silent.

"I think it will not be an easy task to discover any thing like an equivalent gained by the Northern States, for the admission of the negroes into the mass of inhabitants in the Southern States, in order to swell the size of the representation in the general Congress. The importance of this point to the Southern States, will strikingly appear by a very slight examination. **NEGROES ARE IN ALL RESPECTS, EXCEPT IN REGARD TO LIFE AND DEATH, THE CATTLE OF THE CITIZENS OF THE SOUTHERN STATES.** *If they were good for food, THE PROBABILITY IS, THAT EVEN THE POWER OF DESTROYING THEIR LIVES WOULD BE ENJOYED BY THEIR OWNERS, AS FULLY AS IT IS OVER THE LIVES OF THEIR CATTLE. It cannot be, that their laws prohibit the owners from killing their slaves, because those slaves are human beings, or because it is regarded as a moral evil to destroy them.* If that were the case, how can they justify their being treated in all other respects like brutes? For it is in this point of view alone, that negroes in the Southern States, are considered in fact as different from cattle. *They are bought and sold; they are fed or kept hungry; they are clothed or reduced to nakedness; they are beaten, turned out to the fury of the tempest, and torn from their dearest connexions, with as little remorse as if they were beasts of the field.* On what principle, then, were they noticed among their masters in the scale of representation? They have no interests to protect; no happiness to advance; the laws afford them no security except for their lives; and the government furnishes them with no advantages. *If, to balance this claim, the Northern States had demanded, that three-fifths of the whole number of their horses and cattle should be added to the amount of free persons,* the claim, doubtless, would have been rejected with indignation. But it was thought expedient that the Southern States should be indulged, in a claim equally absurd and unfounded. Where the equivalent rests, I am ignorant.

"When it becomes a serious question, *whether we shall give up our government, or PART WITH THE STATES SOUTH OF THE POTOMAC, no man north of that river, whose heart is not thoroughly democratic, can hesitate what decision to make.* That this question is nearly ripe for decision, there can be but little doubt. It is therefore time that the public mind should be employed in examining it attentively, in order, that *when the period arrives, the decision may be made coolly and with firmness.*"

The nefarious project met with no countenance at that period, and was so completely frowned down by public opinion, that the projectors abandoned it, and retired from the arena in silence.

SECOND PROJECT.

When parties are disposed to revolt, there is no difficulty in finding a plea, to which eloquence and sophistry can give a colouring that may suffice to captivate the great mass of a community, who rarely take the pains necessary to investigate such subjects. Any grievance, real or imaginary, is sufficient. If real, it is magnified an hundred fold. If imaginary, confident assertion, and unceasing reiteration will gain credit for it, however destitute of foundation. And it is no rare occurrence to find the wisest measures of government forming the leading features of the attacks by which it is attempted to be prostrated.

The ground assumed during the administration of Mr. Jefferson and Mr. Madison, was, that our government was under the control of Bonaparte, and subservient to his interests—and that England had done us no wrong, or, if she had, that she was disposed to repair our wrongs. One of the most outrageous pamphlets that appeared at this period was published in New York, under the title of “National Wrongs—set forth in a Letter addressed to James Madison. By a North American. New York.—Printed for the author—1814.” Behold the spirit of this fire-brand publication.

“If the impending negotiation with Great Britain is defeated by insidious artifice; if the friendly and conciliating proposals of the enemy should not, from French subserviency, or views of sectional ambition, be met throughout by a spirit of moderation and sincerity, so as to terminate THE INFAMOUS WAR which is scattering its horrors around us, and avert the calamities and distress of a disgraced country, it is necessary to apprise you, that such conduct will be no longer borne with. The injured States will be compelled, by every motive of duty, interest, and honour; by one manly exertion of their strength, TO DASH INTO ATOMS THE BOND OF TYRANNY. It will then be too late to retract. The die will be cast. Freedom preserved.

“A separation of the States will be an inevitable result. Motives numerous and urgent will demand that measure. As they originate in oppression, the oppressors must be responsible for the momentous and contingent events, arising from THE DISSOLUTION OF THE PRESENT CONFEDERACY, AND THE ERECTION OF SEPARATE GOVERNMENTS. It will be their work. While posterity will admire the independent spirit of the eastern section of our country, and, with sentiments of gratitude, enjoy the fruits of their firmness and wisdom—the descendants of the south and west, will have reason to curse the infatuation and folly of your councils.

“Bold and resolute, when they step forth in the sacred cause of freedom and independence, the northern people will secure their object. No obstacle can impede them. No force can withstand their powerful arm. The most numerous armies will melt before their manly strength.

“Does not the page of history instruct you, that the feeble debility of the South never could face the vigorous activity of the North? Do not the events of past ages remind you of the valuable truth, that a single spark of Northern liberty, especially when enlightened by congenial commerce, will explode a whole atmosphere of sultry Southern despotism? You well know the termination of the expedition of Xerxes, with his hundreds of thousands, against the Greeks. The commercial Athenians taught the debilitated tyrant of Asia, on the plains of Marathon, and at the strait of Salamis, of what exertions freedom is capable, when roused by oppression. The hardy Macedonians not only defeated and dispersed countless hordes of southern effeminacy, but traversed their country at pleasure.

“The aggregate strength of the South and West, if brought against the North, would be driven into the ocean, or back to their own sultry wilds—and they might think themselves fortunate if they escaped other punishment than defeat, which their temerity would merit. While the one would strive to enslave, the other would fight for freedom. While the councils of the one would be distracted with discordant interests, the deci-

sions of the other would be directed by one soul. Beware! pause! before you take the fatal plunge.

"You have carried your oppressions to the utmost stretch. *We will no longer submit.* Restore the constitution to its purity. Give us security for the future; indemnity for the past. Abolish every tyrannical law. Make an honourable peace. Revive our commerce. Increase our navy. Protect our seamen. **UNLESS YOU COMPLY WITH THESE JUST DEMANDS, WITHOUT DELAY, WE WILL WITHDRAW FROM THE UNION, SCATTER TO THE WINDS THE BOND OF TYRANNY, AND TRANSMIT TO POSTERITY, THAT LIBERTY PURCHASED BY THE REVOLUTION.**"

"It is said that to make a treaty of commerce with the enemy is to violate the Constitution and to SEVER THE UNION. Are they not both already virtually destroyed? Or in what state of existence would they be, *should we declare a neutrality, or even withhold taxes or men?*"—Boston Centinel, Dec. 17, 1814.

"By a *commercial treaty with England*, which shall provide for the admission of such states as may wish to come into it, and which shall prohibit England from making a treaty with the South and West, which does not grant us at least equal privileges with herself, our commerce will be secured to us; our standing in the Nation raised to its proper level; and *New England feelings will no longer be sported with, or her interests violated.*"—Ibid.

"**IF WE SUBMIT QUIETLY, OUR DESTRUCTION IS CERTAIN.** If we oppose them, with a high-minded, and steady conduct, who will say that we shall not beat them back? No one can suppose that a *conflict with a tyranny at home*, would be as easy as with an enemy abroad. But firmness will anticipate and prevent it.—*Cowardice dreads it*—and will surely bring it on at last. **WHY THEN DELAY?** Why leave that to chance which firmness should command? Will our wavering frighten government into compliance?"—Ibid.

"We must do it deliberately—and not from irritation at our wrongs or sufferings. *And when we have once entered on the high course of honour and INDEPENDENCE*, let no difficulties stay our course, no dangers drive us back."—Ibid.

"We must be no longer deafened by senseless clamours about **A SEPARATION OF THE STATES.**"—Idem, Jan. 13, 1814.

"Let no consideration whatever, my brethren, deter you at all times, and in all places, from execrating the present war. It is a war unjust, foolish, and ruinous. It is unjust, because **GREAT BRITAIN HAS OFFERED US EVERY CONCESSION, SHORT OF WHAT SHE CONCEIVES WOULD BE HER RUIN.**"—Rev. Mr. Gaidiner's Discourse, July 23, 1812, page 5.

"The Union has been long since virtually dissolved: And it is full time, that this part of the disunited states should take care of itself!"—Idem, page 19.

"The Israelites became weary of yielding the fruit of their labour to pamper their splendid tyrants. They left their political woes. **THEY SEPARATED—WHERE IS OUR MOSES!!!** *Where is the rod of his miracles!!! Where is our Aaron!!!* Alas! no voice from the burning bush, has directed them here."—Rev. E. Parrish's Discourse, delivered at Byfield, April 7, 1814, page 18.

"Alas! **WE HAVE NO MOSES TO STRETCH HIS ROD OVER THE SEA!!!** No Lebanon, nor Carmel, nor Zion, to invite us across the deep!"—Idem, page 14.

It is by no means my intention to defend the insurrectionary movements in New England, during the late war: but that they were incomparably more justifiable than those in South Carolina at present, I hope to make fully appear by a quotation from the "New Olive Branch."

"New England then depended for her prosperity almost altogether on commerce, as the government had, with singular fatuity, never adequately encouraged the vital interest of manufactures, the great handmaid and support of agriculture, for which we had so many advantages. The commerce of the nation was almost entirely annihilated, and great distress in consequence prevailed in New England. Her ships were rotting at the wharves. Her capital lay idle. Real estate sunk in value in many instances, 20, 30, and 40 per cent. Many of our staples were in some de

gree valueless; and a portion of the population of the New England states was destitute of employment, by the total stagnation of commerce. This was a state of things calculated to drive a people to madness, and to palliate excesses and disaffection.

"A comparison of the exports of some years previous to the war, with those at that period, will shed a flood of light on this interesting subject.

"The exports, foreign and domestic, of the United States, for twelve years,		
1800 to 1811, inclusive, were	- - - - -	\$879,225,102
Averaging	- - - - -	\$73,268,758
"For 1809, '10, and '11		180,278,036
Average	- - - - -	60,092,678
"In 1813 and 1814		34,783,438
Average	- - - - -	17,391,719
"In 1814, domestic exports,		6,782,272
"Foreign	- - - - -	145,169
		<hr/>
Total for 1814,		\$6,927,441

"This was a fearful fall from 60 or 70,000,000 dollars, to less than \$7,000,000.

"Here was a state of ruin, actual and prospective; and no likelihood of a speedy termination, as the British had so completely triumphed over France and all her allies, that their forces were liberated in Europe, to be let loose on us, to ravage our coasts, and complete the destruction of the little commerce that remained.

"How immensely different is the case with the citizens of South Carolina! It is a molehill compared with a mountain. Their grand staple commands cash, and a steady market, and is at about the prices that it bore in 1823.* They purchase almost every article they consume, foreign and domestic, at a reduction of from 25 to 50 per cent. Can, therefore, the nullifiers of South Carolina—and I put the question to their prime leaders, Judge Cooper (to whom the effervescence chiefly owes its origin), Governor Hamilton, Mr. Hayne, Ex-Governor Miller, and Mr. McDuffie—plead a tenth part so strong an apology as the Hartford Convention? That they cannot, however they may wince at the question, is the award which posterity will pass on their proceedings.

THIRD PROJECT.

The chief grounds at present assumed to the South are, the unconstitutionality of the protecting system—and the oppression and robbery perpetrated on the South by the tariff, which transfers, it is asserted, the property of the citizens of that quarter into the pockets of the citizens of the middle and eastern states; although so far as the constitutionality of the system is concerned, the practice of the government and the opinions

* Charleston, May 19, 1823, prime uplands - - - - - 9 a 11½
 " June 9, 1832, " " - - - - - 10¼ a 10 3-4

of George Washington, Thomas Jefferson, James Madison, Fisher Ames, and a host of other citizens of the highest standing, had sanctioned the constitutionality of the measure for above thirty years without the slightest objection being made to it—and although, I repeat, every article sufficiently protected, has been greatly reduced in price—some of them 50 per cent. I annex specimens of the style used by some of the advocates of “resistance.”

“We did think—we have always thought, and we still think, that the true and best policy for this country, or any other, is to meet encroachment at the very *threshold* with resistance—with *firm, unwavering, unbleaching resistance*. Nothing has ever yet been or ever will be gained either by nations or individuals, by pursuing a temporising, prudential, calculating policy. It is a doubtful question whether prudence is at any time a virtue. If it is, however, and there ever can happen circumstances under which it may cease to be so considered, we do most humbly conceive, that there can be no more appropriate an occasion for it to throw aside that garb, than when the honour and the dearest interests of nations are implicated. It was in compliance with these principles, that we took the decided stand which we did in *opposition to the usurpations of the General Government*—and called upon our State Legislature, to **NULLIFY THE TARIFF LAW**, and put the State immediately upon its sovereignty.—What we then said, we again reiterate, and we repeat it as the *last official appeal* which we shall ever make. In the spirit of patriotism, then, fellow citizens of South Carolina—by the injuries which you have sustained—by the shades of *your revolutionary fathers*—by *your Pinckneys, your Rutledges, your Draytons, your Manions*—by the *lion soul of your living Sumpter*—by the *manes of Rawlin Lowndes*, that man who opposed the Federal Constitution, because he foresaw that it was nursing the Newæan monster that would one day strangle the liberties of the South—by the streaming blood of the constitution—by your violated league—by all you hold sacred to yourselves and dear to posterity—**RISE UP AND REDRESS YOUR WRONGS!!! STRIKE FOR COUNTRY AND FOR HOME! NOW'S THE TIME, AND NOW'S THE HOUR. REMEMBER THAT PROCRASTINATION IS SLAVERY—AND FORGET NOT, WE CONJURE YOU, THAT ONE HOUR OF VIRTUOUS LIBERTY IS WORTH A WHOLE ETERNITY OF BONDAGE.**—*Southern Radical*, 1828.

“Let Congress be distinctly told, that *either the general government must recede from its pretensions to inordinate powers, or the STATE MUST RECEDE FROM THE COMPACT*: and should that government resolutely persist in the scheme of subverting our prosperity and sovereignty to their very foundation, *let the governor be directed, by proclamation, to open our ports to the vessels of all nations, not excepting even those of our northern friends or enemies. Let no customs be exacted, except by our own officers; and let all judges, magistrates, constables, and other citizens, be called upon to support the state authority and laws, and be INDEMNIFIED FOR DISOBEDIENCE TO FEDERAL AUTHORITIES. All this may be done without the spilling of one drop of blood.* There will be no necessity for firing a gun. Let the United States government fire the first shot if it chooses. Better it would be that it had been born with a mill-stone around its neck, than to try this. *We must take care not to be the aggressors IN THE SHEDDING OF BLOOD.*”—*Milledgeville Journal*.

“**THE MEMORABLE SCENES OF OUR REVOLUTION HAVE AGAIN TO BE ACTED OVER.**”—*Idem*.

The preceding paragraphs afford a specimen of the language held respecting the Tariff of 1828, about the period of its passage. When under discussion, it was obnoxious to both parties, and was called, I believe by both, “*a Bill of abominations.*” Some of its most odious features, be it observed, were introduced, or at least retained by southern votes.

About ten years since, Mr. M'Duffie drew a most graphic picture of the motives of the men likely to attempt to excite hostility between the general and state governments, and, by necessary consequence, to dissolve the

Union. This picture met with the decided approbation of Major, now Governor Hamilton, who republished it with strong encomiums. Yet these gentlemen are among the most prominent leaders of the insurrectionary movements of South Carolina. How far this portrait applies to them or any other of the leaders, I will not pretend to say. I leave that question to be decided by the reader.

"AMBITIOUS MEN OF INFERIOR TALENTS, FINDING THEY HAVE NO HOPE TO BE DISTINGUISHED IN THE COUNCILS OF THE NATIONAL GOVERNMENT, NATURALLY WISH TO INCREASE THE POWER AND CONSEQUENCE OF THE STATE GOVERNMENTS, THE THEATRES IN WHICH THEY EXPECT TO ACQUIRE DISTINCTION. *It is not, therefore, a regard for the rights of the people, and a real apprehension that those rights are in danger, that have caused so much to be said on the subject of prostrate state sovereignties and consolidated empire. It is the ambition of that class of politicians, who expect to figure only in the state councils, and of those states who are too proud to acknowledge any superior.*"—"One of the People."—Written by the Hon. George M'Duffie, member of Congress from South Carolina, and countersigned by Major Hamilton, now Governor of South Carolina.

"HE MUST HAVE READ THE LESSONS OF HISTORY TO LITTLE PURPOSE, WHO DOES NOT PERCEIVE THAT THE PEOPLE OF PARTICULAR STATES ARE LIABLE TO FALL, OCCASIONALLY, INTO A DANGEROUS AND MORBID EXCITEMENT UPON PARTICULAR SUBJECTS; AND THAT UNDER THIS EXCITEMENT, THEY WILL IMPEL THEIR RULERS INTO THE ADOPTION OF MEASURES IN THEIR TENDENCY DESTRUCTIVE TO THE UNION."—*Idem.*

"*If, after the National Judiciary have solemnly affirmed the constitutionality of a law, it is still to be resisted by the state rulers, the constitution is literally at an end; a revolution of the government is already accomplished; and anarchy waves his horrid sceptre over the broken altars of this happy Union!*"—*Idem.*

What a revolting contrast between these holy doctrines, so overwhelming and irresistible, and the insurrectionary doctrines promulgated in the recent manifesto, to which the name of Mr. M'Duffie is appended, and similar doctrines boldly announced in Congress and elsewhere by that gentleman and some of his colleagues! *par exemple.*

"*Shall we be terrified by mere phantoms of blood, when our ancestors, for less cause, encountered the dreadful reality? Great God! are we the descendants of those ancestors—are we freemen—are we men—grown men—to be frightened from the discharge of our most sacred duty, and the vindication of our most sacred rights, by the mere nursery stories of raw-head and bloody-bones?*"—Mr. McDuffie's Dinner Speech.

Mr. McDuffie triumphantly and unanswerably refuted in 1821 the pernicious and disorganizing doctrines on which the nullifiers rest the justification of the course they pursue—those doctrines which tend to lay the General Government prostrate at the feet of the State Governments, declaring the right of any individual State to repeal, or, to use the fashionable phrase, "nullify" any law of the United States which it deems unconstitutional—doctrines utterly subversive of all government.

"The state governments are the absolute creatures of the people; and have no political powers not delegated to them by their respective constitutions, and consistent with the constitution of the United States. The states, as political bodies, have no original, inherent rights. THAT THEY HAVE SUCH RIGHTS IS A FALSE, DANGEROUS, AND ANTI-REPUBLICAN ASSUMPTION, WHICH LURKS AT THE BOTTOM OF ALL THE REASONING IN FAVOUR OF STATE RIGHTS."

"The assumption of the state authorities will appear still more glaring and unwar-

ratable, when we reflect, that whatever is assumed as a "state right," pertains equally to every state in the Union, separately and individually."

"I can conscientiously say, (and I stand upon constitutional ground when I say so,) that I have, as a citizen of the Union, precisely as much confidence in the general government as I have in the Government of my own state, and infinitely more than I can or ought to have in the government of the other states. I think too highly of the people of the United States, to suppose that they will tolerate any encroachments of the national government, that shall endanger their liberty. As to those imaginary rights, that are by some supposed to exist in the states, in contradistinction to the people of the states, I neither understand nor regard them. They are mere sounds, used by misguided or designing men, for the advancement of their popularity in particular sections of the Union."

"WE HAVE MORE CAUSE OF APPREHENSION FROM THE STATES, THAN FROM THE GENERAL GOVERNMENT; OR, IN OTHER WORDS, THERE IS IN OUR SYSTEM A GREATER TENDENCY TO DISUNION THAN TO CONSOLIDATION."

"The laws of the Union, clothed with the most solemn sanctions of the constitution, have been, under the extreme pressure of local embarrassment, absolutely resisted by the state authorities. After the supreme tribunal of the country pronounced an act of Congress constitutional, and, consequently, the supreme law of the land, a state government has openly opposed its execution. It will be readily understood, that I allude to the embarrassing conflict of authority between the general government and the state of Ohio, in relation to the National Bank. And I hesitate not to pronounce it one of the most portentous events that has occurred since the adoption of the federal constitution."

"You assert that when any conflict shall occur between the general and state governments, as to the extent of their respective powers, 'EACH PARTY HAS A RIGHT TO JUDGE FOR ITSELF!' I confess I am at a loss to know how such a proposition ought to be treated. No CLIMAX OF POLITICAL HERESIES CAN BE IMAGINED, IN WHICH THIS MIGHT NOT FAIRLY CLAIM THE MOST PROMINENT PLACE. IT RESOLVES THE GOVERNMENT, AT ONCE, INTO THE ELEMENTS OF PHYSICAL FORCE; AND INTRODUCES US DIRECTLY INTO A SCENE OF ANARCHY AND BLOOD. There is not a single power delegated to the general government, which it would not be in the power of every state government to destroy under the authority of this licentious principle."

"To suppose that the general government have a constitutional right to exercise certain powers, which must operate upon the people of the states, and yet that the government of each state has a right to fix and determine its own relative powers, and by necessary consequence, to limit the powers of the general government, is to suppose the existence of two contradictory and inconsistent rights. In all governments there must be some one supreme power; in other words, every question that can arise as to the constitutional extent of the powers of different classes of functionaries, must be susceptible of a legal and peaceable determination by some tribunal of acknowledged authority, or force must be the inevitable consequence. And where force begins, government ends."

"There is no incidental power more clearly given by the Constitution, (and even you admit incidental powers) and certainly there is none at once more harmless and salutary, than that of making internal improvements."—Mr. McDuffie's, "One of the People."

Let me observe further, that Judge Cooper and Mr. Calhoun, at no very distant day, were among the most prominent advocates of the protecting system, which they now denounce as unconstitutional, and ground the resistance to its operation, i. e. rebellion, which they unequivocally advocate, on its unconstitutionality!

These are strong facts deserving of the most serious attention of all who have any interest in the welfare, prosperity, and peace of the country. The former and present opinions of these four gentlemen are as diametrically opposite as the highest empyrean and the lowest abysses of Erebus. If they were correct at the former period, as, on a fair view of the subject, it appears they were, they must be radically and incurably wrong at present, and therefore are wholly unsafe guides, on a question of such mighty importance to the whole civilized world, as a dissolution of the Union, for "disguise it as they may," that is the precise meaning of nullification—a question on which a false step is irremediable.

So extraordinary are the hallucinations to which nations are subject in times of great effervescence, and from which men of enlightened minds cannot claim an exemption, that nothing of this description ought to surprise us much. History is replete with examples. I shall quote two or three striking instances in our own short experience.

During the administration of Gen. Washington, no small portion of the Democrats believed that Jay's Treaty was the result of a corrupt bargain with the Court of St. James's; and that one of its objects was to distress France, and to commit us in hostility with that country; and many of them believed that the signature of that treaty cancelled all the debt of gratitude due by this country to the illustrious Washington. Others among them, (Mr. Jefferson was one,) were persuaded that the western insurrection was nothing more than a mere riot, and that the army was sent to the westward to create an insurrection!

Not to be outdone in folly, a large portion of the federalists were persuaded that Mr. Jefferson and his cabinet were actually in the pay of Bonaparte: that the war of 1812 was wanton and unprovoked: that it was intended to aid him in his wild attempt upon Russia: that Great Britain with her thousand ships of war had done us no wrong: and that that nation was at all times ready to make arrangements with us on honourable terms, but that Mr. Jefferson repelled her advances!

It remains to be seen whether equal hallucinations at least do not prevail at the South at present.

NO. 3.

At the last session of Congress, the tariff of 1828 was taken up in the spirit of compromise, and numerous modifications were made, by some of which the interests of particular branches of manufactures were materially injured. It was fondly hoped that these modifications would allay the effervescence in South Carolina, and arrest the insurrectionary movements in that state. But unfortunately the expectation was vain—for the leaders have become more violent and more determined to carry into effect their destructive schemes.

For we are gravely assured, and in a solemn appeal to the heated passions of the southern States, by citizens of high standing:—Messrs. Hayne and Miller, of the Senate, and Messrs. McDuffie, Davis, Felder, Griffin, Nuckolls, and Barnwell, of the House of Representatives, that the new tariff is more oppressive to the southern states, than that of 1828!!

“*The burdens of the PROTECTING DUTIES are decidedly increased, estimating the cash duties and diminished credits at an average of more than fifty per cent, while the duties on the unprotected articles, which, upon every principle of equality and justice, should sustain the principal part of the burdens of taxation, are, with a few inconsiderable exceptions, entirely repealed.*”

“*Upon those manufactures which are received in exchange for the staple productions of the Southern States, THE AGGREGATE INCREASE OF THE BURDENS OF TAXATION, BEYOND WHAT THEY WERE UNDER THE TARIFF OF 1828, IS BELIEVED TO BE UPWARDS OF ONE MILLION OF DOLLARS!!! While the reduction or repeal of the duties on those imports which we receive in exchange for the productions of the Tariff States, [!] and are principally consumed in those States, [?] amounts to about four millions of dollars. While, therefore, the aggregate burdens of Taxation are diminished four millions of dollars by this Bill, the positive burdens of the Southern States are not diminished at all, and their relative burdens are very greatly increased.*”—Address of Messrs.

Hayne, Miller, McDuffie, Davis, Felder, Nuckolls, and Barnwell, to the Citizens of South Carolina.

1. Mr. M'Duffie has asserted, that the southern states pay forty per cent. of the revenue. The reduction by the new tariff, is from 6 to \$10,000,000,—say the former sum. Forty per cent. on 6,000,000, is 2,400,000, reduced, according to Mr. M'Duffie's own statement, from the contributions of the southern states. Is this large reduction more burdensome to the South?

2. The debate on cotton bagging in 1824, occupied eight or ten days. It was asserted that the addition of a cent a square yard would operate most oppressively on the cotton planters, and, if I recollect rightly, would tax them to the amount of above 100,000 dollars annually. The duty is now reduced 30 per cent., from 5 cents to $3\frac{1}{2}$. Is this more burdensome to the South?

3. By the tariff of 1828, baizes were estimated to have cost 50 cents per square yard, and were subject to 45 per cent. on that rate, or $22\frac{1}{2}$ cents per square yard. By the new tariff they are subject to 16 cents per square yard. Is this more burdensome to the South?

4. By the tariff of 1828, blankets were subject to $38\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. duty. By the new tariff, those which cost below 75 cents, are to pay 5 per cent. Those above 75 cents, pay 25. Is this more burdensome to the South?

5. Iron, in bars or bolts, was subject to \$37 per ton. It is now to pay 30. Is this more burdensome to the South?

6. Kendal cottons, paid 14 cents per square yard, equal to about 60 per cent. They are to pay 5 per cent. Is this more burdensome to the South?

7. Brown sugar paid 3 cents per lb. It is to pay $2\frac{1}{2}$.—The reduction is $16\frac{2}{3}$ per cent. Is this more burdensome to the South?

8. White, clayed, or powdered sugar paid 4 cents per lb. It is now to pay $3\frac{1}{3}$ cents per lb. The reduction is, $16\frac{2}{3}$ per cent. Is this more burdensome to the South?

9. Teas of various kinds, paid duties averaging about 30 cents per lb. They are in future to be free. Is this more burdensome to the South?

10. Coffee paid 5 cents per lb. by the tariff of 1828—and by that of 1830, one cent. It is now free. Is this more burdensome to the South?

11. Woollen goods, by the minimum arrangement of 1828, were subject to duties which might, and occasionally did, amount to upwards of 100 per cent. The minimum duties, which were more grievously complained of than any other portion of the tariff, are abolished, and the duty is 50 per cent. ad valorem. Is that more oppressive to the South?

12. Woollen goods not exceeding $33\frac{1}{3}$ cents per square yard, paid 14 cents per square yard, averaging from 45 to 50 per cent. They are to pay 5 per cent. Is this more burdensome to the South?

13. Bombazeens, Norwich crapes, &c. paid 36 per cent. They are to pay 10 per cent. Is this more burdensome to the South?

14. Silk goods from beyond the Cape of Good Hope, paid 36 per cent. They are to pay 10 per cent. From this side the Cape, they paid 22 per cent. They are to pay 5 per cent. Is this more burdensome to the South?

15. Linens paid 27.5 per cent. They are to pay 15 per cent. Is this more burdensome to the South?

16. Hats, of Leghorn, straw, chip, &c. paid 55 per cent, besides a dollar minimum. They are to pay 30 per cent. Is this more burdensome to the South?

17. Wines, Madeira and Sherry, paid 50 cents per gallon. They are to pay 25 cents. Is this more burdensome to the South?

18. Wines, from France, red and white, averaged $12\frac{1}{2}$ cents. They are to average 4 cents. Is this more burdensome to the South?

19. Worsted stuff goods, viz. bombazets, ratinets, moreens, lastings, &c. paid $27\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. They are to pay 10 per cent. Is this more burdensome to the South?

20. Hemp paid 60 dollars per ton. It is to pay 40. Is this more burdensome to the South?

21. Wools, costing less than 8 cents per lb. paid, according to the tariff of 1828, 4 cents per lb., and 50 per cent. on the value. They are to be duty free. Is this more burdensome to the South?

22. Straw matting from China, of which large quantities are imported, pays at present 15 cents per square yard, equal to about 150 per cent. It is in future to pay 5 per cent. Is this more burdensome to the South?

Various other important reductions have been made in the tariff, some of which I annex.

	1828.	1832.
23. Nankeens, from China, per cent.	30	20
24. Window Glass, 10 by 15, p. 100 feet,	\$5	\$4
25. Wool, above 8 cents per lb.	4 cents per lb. and 55 per ct.	4 cents, and 40 per cent.
26. Woollen hosiery, gloves, mits, &c per ct.	38.5	25
27. Wood, manufactures of, do.	33	25
28. Copper, vessels of, do.	38.5	25
29. Side and fire arms, do.	33	25
30. Adzes, axes, &c. do.	38.5	30
31. Clothing, ready made, do.	55	50
32. Cyphering slates, do.	36.33	25
33. Hair cloth, do.	33	15*

To the articles at present exempt from duty, the following are to be added, from the 3d of March, 1833,—Cocoa, almonds, currants, prunes, figs, raisins, black pepper, ginger, mace, nutmegs, cinnamon, cassia, cloves, pimento, crude saltpetre, flax unmanufactured, quicksilver, opium, quills unprepared, tin in platos and sheets, unmanufactured marble, argol, gum Arabic, gum Senegal, epaulettes of gold and silver, lac dye, madder, nuts and berries used in dyeing, saffron, turmeric, woad and pastel, aloes, ambergris, burgundy pitch, Peruvian bark, cochineal, capers, chamomile flowers, coriander seed, cantharides, castanas, catsup, chalk, coculus Indicus, coral, dates, filberts, filtering stones, horn plates for lanterns, ox horns, India rubber, ippecacuanha, ivory unmanufactured, juniper berries, musk, nuts of all kinds, olives, oil of juniper, paintings and drawings, rattans unmanufactured, reeds unmanufactured, rhubarb, rotten stone, tamarinds, tortoise shell, tin foil, shellac, sponges, sago, lemons, limes, pine apples, cocoa nuts and shells, iris or aris root, arrowroot, sal ammoniac, colombo root, annatto, anniseed, oil of anniseed, oil of cloves, cummin seed, sarsaparilla, balsam tolu, assafœtida, ava root, alcornoque, canella alba, cascarilla, Haerlem oil, heartsborn, manna,

* In these tables, the duties are stated as actually paid—that is to say, the ten per cent, added at the custom house to the amount of the invoice, is here added to the duty. Thus a nominal only of 30 was really a duty of 33 per cent.

senna, tapioca, vanilla beans, oil of almonds, nux vomica, amber, platina, busts of marble, metal or plaster; casts of bronze or plaster, strings of musical instruments, flints, kelp, kermes, pins, needles, mother of pearl, hair unmanufactured, hair pencils, Brazil paste, tartar crude; vegetables, such as are used principally in dyeing and in composing dyes, &c. &c. And further,—All articles not enumerated in this act and which are now liable to an ad valorem duty of 15 per cent. (except tartar emetic, Rochelle salts, sulphate of quinine, calomel, corrosive sublimate, sulphate of magnesia and glauber salts,) are henceforth free of duty. Are these exemptions more burdensome to the South?

It is confidently asserted by the nullifiers and their friends, that the alteration of the currency of the pound sterling from 444 cents to its real value, 480 cents, and the reduction of the credits from an average of about ten months to four, more than countervail the reduction of the duties, and thus render the new tariff more burdensome than the old. Let us test this assertion by figures:

We will take £1,000 sterling worth of adzes, axes, &c, which paid 30 per cent. under the old tariff, and will pay 25 per cent. under the new.

1828.		1832.	
£1,000 equal to	\$444 44	£1,000, equal to	\$4,800 00
10 per cent. added,	444 44		
	<u>4,888 88</u>	25 per cent.	1,200 00
Duty 30 per cent. - -	1,460 66	Difference in favour of the importer,	232 66
Deduct 6 months' discount, at			<u>1,432 66</u>
4 per cent. per annum,	28 00		
	<u>1,432 66</u>		

The discount allowed for prompt payment by government is only 4 per cent. The credit formerly averaged 10 months; at present it is only four, for all except woollens, on which there is no credit: making a difference of six months against the importer, under the present tariff, compared with the tariff of 1828—and of the whole ten in regard to woollens.

£1,000 worth of hosiery at 35 per cent. in 1828.		At 25 per cent in future.	
£1,000, equal to	\$4,444 44	£1,000, equal to	\$4,800 00
10 per cent. added,	444 44		
	<u>4,888 88</u>	25 per cent.	1,200 00
Duty, 35 per cent. -	1,711 10	Difference in favour of the importer,	476 88
Deduct 6 months' discount,	34 22		<u>\$1,676 88</u>
Net duty	\$1,676 88		

It must not be overlooked that the alteration of the value of the pound sterling affects no imports but those from Great Britain, and even of those none but such as are subject to ad valorem duties.

Here it is proper to make a solemn pause on the very verge of a tremendous precipice, one desperate plunge into which would lead to civil war with all its fearful aggregation of horrors. We find eight citizens, ranking among the first in the land, promulgating a document which is regarded—perhaps intended—as a signal to invite a single state to resist laws duly enacted by a majority of the representatives of the whole Union—a resistance which is neither more nor less than rebellion—and this measure is urged on a ground, which, when fairly examined,

vanishes, "*like the baseless fabric of a vision, and leaves not a trace behind.*" The assertion, that the new tariff is more burdensome to the South, than the tariff of 1828, is, as we have seen, not only unsupported by fact, but is most unequivocally contradicted by fact, and utterly destitute of the shadow of foundation.

I will not allow myself to believe that these gentlemen attempted fully to deceive the public. Their characters place them too high for such a suspicion. But that they have laboured under an hallucination as complete as any of those above alluded to, will hardly be denied.—And unhappily, an error on such an important subject, resulting from a want of careful investigation, may produce as fatal results, as an egregious, willful misstatement. That these gentlemen have been most culpably remiss in committing themselves by such an erroneous document without due investigation, will not admit of a moment's doubt. And is it not highly probable—nay, almost certain—that they have fallen into equal errors in those metaphysical abstractions and dogmatic opinions which they and their friends have promulgated on this momentous subject, by which the passions of the citizens of South Carolina have been roused to madness, and a portion of the state made ready "*to renew the bloody scenes of the revolution?*"

What a melancholy view this circumstance presents of human affairs! On what slender threads the peace and happiness of nations depend! Here are, I repeat, eight citizens, who, from station, cultivation, and standing, are arrayed in the front ranks of society, who, for want of proper investigation, sanctioned with their honoured names, what is proved to be not only not true, but the reverse of truth, of which the direct tendency is to destroy the peace and happiness of 13,000,000 of souls and their descendants—to array father against son, son against father, and brother against brother—to make a jubilee for the friends of despotism throughout the world—and to cover the friends of mankind with gloom and horror—and finally to give strength to the sickening and appalling maxim, that man is incapable of self-government! Alas! for human nature!

Thus we have seen three attempts to destroy the Union. Two of them, thank heaven, failed. May the God of infinite mercy, who has brought the country through so many dangers and difficulties, defeat and blast and wither the third! "*So mote it be.*"

The language of the different periods is different—the motives assigned for action are different—the pleas of justification are different—but the grand object of all is the same—**THE DISSOLUTION OF THE UNION—THE PERDITION OF THE SANGUINE HOPES OF THE FIRST AND BEST OF MANKIND THROUGHOUT THE CIVILIZED WORLD. LET ME ADJURE YOU, FELLOW CITIZENS OF THE SOUTH, BY THE IMMORTAL MEMORY OF THE ILLUSTRIOUS WASHINGTON, TO ASK YOURSELVES THE QUESTION, COOLLY AND CALMLY, ARE YOU PREPARED FOR THIS HIDEOUS STATE OF THINGS, AND ITS INEVITABLE RESULT, CIVIL AND SOCIAL WARS!**

HAMILTON.



LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



0 011 896 325 8

